

The Evening World.

ESTABLISHED BY JOSEPH PULITZER.
Published Daily Except Sundays by The Press Publishing Company, No. 53 to 63 Park Row, New York.
J. ANGELO STEWART, President, 63 Park Row.
JOSEPH PULITZER, Jr., Secretary, 63 Park Row.

MEMBER OF THE ASSOCIATED PRESS
The Associated Press is responsible for the use of the word "reproduction" in all news dispatches and for the use of the word "reproduction" in all news dispatches and for the use of the word "reproduction" in all news dispatches.

THE GOLDEN BUS.

THE reported eagerness of the Manhattan Transit Company, whose history and antecedents were described in The Evening World yesterday, to become the operator of a gigantic bus system in this city is another sign of how good the bus looks as a future business proposition.

While there seems to be decided doubt whether this company could make good its alleged claim to a perpetual franchise to run on every street in every first-class city in the State, there is no doubt of the fabulous value of anything approaching such a franchise.

With Mayor Hylan proposing to tear up all the surface lines in the city and replace them with buses, and with private interests hankering after bus privileges, the bus question will need firm and careful handling by the Transit Commission.

On this subject the commission has so far shown itself calm and cool-headed. It has repeatedly affirmed its belief in the wider use of the bus as a feeder and short-haul carrier. But it has declined to accept the bus as a cure-all that shall immediately sweep all other surface transit off the map.

Two weeks ago Chairman McNaney said to The Evening World:

"All this talk about ripping up the surface tracks on a wholesale scale is of a piece with the talk about tearing down the elevated structures. If, as I have roughly estimated, it would take \$300,000,000 to replace the 'L' lines, it would take \$200,000,000 more to buy out and replace the trolley systems.

To spend a round half billion dollars in ripping up and changing around, instead of building new lines and gradually eliminating the old, would be a criminal folly, even if it were possible to finance such a scheme, which it isn't."

As for turning loose a horde of buses to run where they pleased in order to do the surviving surface lines to death, how far would the courts sustain the equity of such a proceeding?

The problem is not as simple as that.

A sweep of the Hylan hand won't solve it.

Nor will the zeal, however intense, of those who see profit in buses.

In the early rounds the groundhog had all the best of it. The coal man claimed a foul on the basis of the weather prediction—rain.

WILL MR. HOWARD STEP DOWN?

THE appointment of James R. Howard to succeed Senator Kenyon of Iowa would be likely to silence most of the criticism of President Harding and Mr. Kenyon voiced by members of the agricultural bloc.

If Senator Kenyon considered a Federal Judgeship a promotion from the Senate, it is hard to conceive how Mr. Howard could consider a Senatorial seat in any light other than a demotion from the influential post he has occupied as chief executive of the Farm Bureau Federation.

Because of his influential position as a dirt farmer leader of the dirt farmers, Mr. Howard could probably play a larger role in the Senate than most new Senators, but it is unlikely that he could wield any such measure of power as he has for the last six months or so.

Since the formation of the agricultural bloc Mr. Howard has been a "boss." He has controlled the votes of many Senators. Can he hope to continue such control? It is improbable.

If Mr. Howard becomes a Republican Senator, he must inevitably step down from his high estate as leader of a non-partisan agrarian movement. Senator Howard as a colleague of Newberry wouldn't loom near so large as Mr. Howard, President of the Farm Bureau Federation.

COMPETITIVE COLLEGE DEGREES.

THE modern college is a high-class country club," according to President Nicholas Murray Butler of Columbia. Prof. Sihler of New York University says:

"Enjoyment of luxury and ease for four years and a little study on the side constitute satisfactory fulfillment of requirement for a college degree nowadays."

If a college degree has lost value, whose fault is it? The students are hardly blamable. The heads of the colleges are. Some students earn their degrees. They work hard and learn.

It does not seem that a return to the classics is the only path which may lead to the restoration of the value and meaning of a degree. But something ought to be done in justice to hard-working students.

The demand for college education exceeds the supply. Institutions of higher learning are driven to selection of students to fit the educational plant available. Some colleges are eliminating the hopelessly by psychological tests.

Why not go further and put college degrees on a competitive basis?

Why not survey the field and determine the maximum number of students who may be instructed adequately in a given institution? Then divide this

total into four groups to correspond to the four years of academic life. Then let the students compete with each other for the prize of a degree.

To show the working of machinery for competitive elimination, let us suppose that the freshman class each year is limited to 1,000 students. The second-year class might be 500, with 300 maximum for the third and 200 for the fourth year. These figures are merely illustrative.

Under a competitive system the familiar "pass grade," which entitles a student to continue his studies, would be eliminated. In place of this he would know that if he were one of the best 500 he could enter the second year, and so on. "Best" would imply habits of study as well as examination marks. Those who "skin through" under the present system would go out. The degree holder would be a picked man. His degree would be a certificate of excellence. He would be one of several who entered the race on even terms with him.

These need not bar the "almost goods" from continuing their studies and improving their minds. But they would not be entitled to degrees. The degree would be reserved for the best. The more rigorous the elimination the more valuable the degree and the more earnestly it would be sought by those who go to college to work instead of to play.

THE GREAT STEP.

DON'T let anybody fool you.

Big things happened at Washington yesterday—things to rejoice over without reservation.

Representatives of the United States, Great Britain, Japan, France and Italy formally and unanimously approved a treaty which puts the old costly habit of competitive dreadnought building into the discard. It means billions of dollars saved henceforth to taxpayers—including taxpayers of the United States. It means suppression of one of the chief incitements to war.

Surely that is something to thank God for.

These same five powers also agreed to ban the submarine as a lawless destroyer of merchant ships.

As Mr. Root significantly observed:

"We may grant that the rules limiting the use of implements of warfare may be violated in the stress of war, but beyond rules and Governments there rests the public opinion of civilization, and the public opinion of the world can punish * * * with punishment that means national ruin."

No nation is going to find it profitable to start a new game of naval rivalry and menace with submarines.

The whole naval armament race is off.

For one reason or another, a considerable part of the public has lost its perspective on the Arms Conference. Secretary Hughes's method of starting with the big bang gave subsequent parleyings and concessions more than due prominence. The cynics had their day.

The moment has now come for the public to get back its vision and cheer with all its voice for the great balance of solid, epoch-making accomplishment.

When the United States Senate gets the Arms Conference treaties it should be left in no doubt as to what an overwhelming majority of the people of the United States expects it to do with them.

The Hylan Business Men's League now confesses that its hindsight on the "5-cent fare issue" is more accurate than its mistaken foresight. But can they convert the Mayor?

ACHES AND PAINS

A Disjointed Column by John Keetz.

It appears the bucket shops are busting because the buckets are empty.

The Burlington Hawkeye is sending abroad an appeal asking newspapers to urge their readers to eat more corn. Corn, it appears, is 55 per cent. of our agriculture output and is being burned instead of eaten. Some of it used to be turned into a beverage called Bourbon. Still we want to help. Why not start up the old lyric:

"I'm Captain Jinks of the Horse Marines;
I feed my wife good corn and beans."

It is 1,283 miles from New York to Palm Beach. Seems such a long distance for Hizzoner to be away from us!

Mrs. Asquith continues to be frank: "If you didn't hear me, you didn't miss much."

Now they can't locate the latest spliver of our sphere. Oliver Hereford once wrote something about "A Bashful Earthquake." Perhaps this was it.

They say Frank Doubleday has sold 7,500,000 copies of Gene Stratton Porter's Lumberlost tales. Pretty good for moths and butterflies. Frank's gone yachting in the wet zone of the British Bahamas.

Boston has a club of Harvard men numbering 2,800 who are down on Prexy A. Lawrence Lowell. Couldn't some kind of a club be welded on Henry Cabot Lodge?

James R. Howard, who is slated to succeed Senator Kenyon of Iowa, so swiftly transplanted to the bench, is credited with owning a 480-acre farm. The poor man!

Shelving Him

Copyright, 1922,
(New York Evening World)
by Press Pub. Co.

By John Cassel



From Evening World Readers

What kind of letter do you find most readable? Isn't it the one that gives the worth of a thousand words in a couple of hundred? There is fine mental exercise and a lot of satisfaction in trying to say much in few words. Take time to be brief.

"Who Are They?"

To the Editor of The Evening World:

I am a constant reader of The Evening World, Times and Sun. Your editorial "Who Are They?" should give food for thought to every thinking person. Nothing along the same lines has appeared in the other two papers so far as has come to my notice.

The truth is that the country, the press and the man on the street are so engrossed in the Prohibition question that business has taken second place. This experiment has cost millions of dollars, loss of life, thrown numberless people out of work, clogged up the judiciary machinery, interfered with the legislative operations at Washington and Albany (and elsewhere) and also proved a failure.

In the last campaign we were told that Prohibition was not an issue, and yet Anderson and his clique are busy with our representatives at Albany on all sorts of dry measures. Is it this exactly the manner in which the 13 of 1 per cent. do things? If we had Al Smith at Albany they never would get away with it.

If we had more papers like The Evening World this nonsensical piece of legislation would be amended or repealed forthwith and we would get back to normalcy on all six days.

WILLIAM MORTIMER,
960 Morris Avenue, Jan. 20, 1922.

St. Peter in Rome.

To the Editor of The Evening World:

Whittaker Anderson criticized your editorial accuracy in your Saturday issue, and declared that no scholar now believed that St. Peter ever was in Rome.

I am not a Roman Catholic, and am animated solely by respect for historical truth. There is abundant external and internal evidence of St. Peter's Roman sojourn.

Take the external first: No one will suspect Dr. Philip Schaff, who was a professor in the Union Theological Seminary of New York, of pro-Roman tendencies. In fact, it was in that chapter of his History of the Christian Church in which he was opposing Papal claims that he says on page 370: "Peter and Mark joined Paul (in the year 63) in Rome." On page 328 he declares, "No scholar now denies that Peter was in Rome." On page 261 he says that Clementine Romanus (whom every scholar knows was the first titular bishop of the primitive church) in Rome, both St. Peter and St. Paul (basing the title of apostles) "in the year 95 A. D. mentions Peter's martyrdom in Rome."

Lipsius, on page 57 of his "History of the Early Christianity," mentions the martyrdom of Peter in Rome, and Holstenfeld, in a work of like title, page 32, also refers to the same subject. Many secular historians refer to the solemn burial of the remains of Peter, on June 29, 258 A. D., in the catacombs of San Sebastian, these remains being taken from the grave of his martyrdom in 65 or 67 in Rome.

Dionysius of Corinth, in the second century, tells of Peter's preaching in Rome, and it only requires a little scholarship to translate Clement's letters when he was consolidating the Jewish converts of St. Peter and the Gentile of St. Paul into the established decrees of Rome, and that before the end of the first century.

Of internal evidence there is Papias, Irenaeus, Tertullian, Cyprian, a presbyter of Rome, Lactantius and Origen, to say nothing of Eusebius, the foremost church historian of his day. Irenaeus (Ad. Hera.), 3.1, says: "While Peter and Paul were preaching at Rome, and laying the foundation of the church."

Clement Alexandrianus, in his catechetical lectures to his school in Alexandria, says: "Peter having publicly preached in Rome." Origen, Papias and Tertullian all agree that Mark took Peter's dictation, producing what is commonly known as the Gospel according to St. Mark, the date of which was A. D. 63-65—and St. Paul, writing to the Colossians at that date, says Mark is with me. The inference is unavoidable that the two apostles were there together.

W. A. NICHOLS,
No. 6 Bishop Street, New Dorp, Jan. 30, 1922.

To the Editor of The Evening World:

While reading your paper on Jan. 28 I was astonished to find a statement from Mr. Whittaker Anderson, who claims that St. Peter was never at Rome. Well, Mr. Anderson, you are very sadly misinformed. Here are a few facts:

St. Peter arrived at Rome in the year of 40 A. D. and established his see there on Jan. 18, having translated it from Antioch.

Before the fourteenth century no person had ventured to deny that St. Peter had dwelt for many years in the city of the Caesars. Marcellus of Cerveteri was the first who advanced a statement. Cane, Pearson, Whiston, Young, Blondel and others, all authors of eminence and opposed to the supremacy of the Holy See, have written against Marcellus and have united with the most eminent Catholic writers in showing the fallacy contained in the writings of those who suppose that St. Peter never had been in Rome.

Cane has well observed that if there be one fact of history which is not to be rejected this, the only logical conclusion you can come to is that history is a mighty conspiracy against truth, and we must become sceptical with respect to all matters which are recorded in it.

J. M'GRATH.

UNCOMMON SENSE

By John Blake

(Copyright, 1922, by John Blake)

KEEP UP YOUR RESERVES.

Reserves win battles and bring victories. The knowledge that they are there and ready to be called on often heartens military leaders to effort that would otherwise be impossible.

Men with mental and physical reserves are men who usually get the prizes in life that are worth having. It has lately been said by somebody that most geniuses have been particularly healthy and enduring people. This does not necessarily follow; but it is certain that unless men and women are healthy and enduring they are never capable of performing the great labor necessary to bring their genius to light.

Few men or women ever use all the knowledge or employ all the skill that they are at great pains to acquire. Yet the knowledge that they have it is enough to strengthen them in their fight to do something important in life.

Physical and mental reserves are equally important. You are no stronger than the machine which bears you about and whose brain does your thinking for you.

If you impair your physical machine, if you overstrain it or do not constantly keep it in condition, it may at any time break down, and snap will go the intangible thing inside it which is yours.

The athlete is just as likely to waste his physical reserves as the sedentary man often does, in fact, as the records of many former champions will show.

It is not athletics in the generally understood sense, not strenuous competition, for prizes that builds up physical reserves, but constant and methodical exercise.

Build up your body, and make sure of your physical reserves. Then attend to your mental reserves. Know more than you need to know for the purposes of the actual job in hand about many subjects.

Get useful information and learn to retain it. And, above all, accustom yourself to sustained periods of effort, for only by these can great things be accomplished.

As well go into a battle in a war without reserves as to enter the battle of life without them. Your will may be an able and fearless general, but without reserves it can win no victories. And the reserves it requires are a strong, sturdy physique, and a mind well stocked with important and usable information.

"That's a Fact"

By Albert P. Southwick

Copyright, 1922, (The New York Evening World)
by The Press Publishing Co.

Munkacsy was the professional name only of the great painter (whose real name was Michael Lieb), derived from the village of Munkacsy in Hungary, where he was born.

The "Orphan of the Temple" was Marie Therese Charlotte, Duchesse d'Angoulême, daughter of Louis XVI, so called from the temple where she was imprisoned. She was called the "Modern Antioch" by her uncle, King Louis XVIII.

As the Saying Is

"BLAZES."

Blazes in English and American slang, a euphemism for the infernal regions, from the flames which theologians are wont to describe. This is evidently the meaning in expressions like "Go to blazes." But in what looks at first sight like an identical expression, "Drunk as blazes," another etymology has been suggested, making it a corruption of Blaisers or Blaisers, i. e., the mummies who took part in the procession in honor of the good Bishop and martyr St. Blaise, patron saint of English wool-combers. The uniform constancy on these occasions made the simile an appropriate one.

Blue Law Persecution

By Dr. S. E. St. Amant.

Copyright, 1922, (New York Evening World)
by Press Publishing Co.

NO. IV.—IN TENNESSEE (Cont.).

Some years ago the State of Tennessee gained an unenviable notoriety because of a large number of Sunday cases, nearly all of them against observers of Saturday, the seventh day of the week. These people were mercilessly persecuted before the courts of that State. Scores were fined, imprisoned and forced to work in chain gangs for observing the Fourth Commandment as it is written in the Decalogue. For the most trifling work done on Sunday, after they had conscientiously rested on Saturday, they were indicted and haled before the courts. Few, if any, escaped conviction and sentence.

Then the Tennessee courts began to see a great light. The court at Gallatin, Tenn., not long ago refused to perpetuate this shameful record any longer against these inoffensive citizens, five of whom had been indicted by the Grand Jury for doing trifling work on Sunday, and placed under bond to answer before the Circuit Court at Gallatin.

In Tennessee the complaining witness is called the prosecutor, and his name appears upon the indictment. The case is prosecuted before the court, however, by the Attorney General of the Judicial district.

Religious prejudice was at the root of the indictments. During the trial this feature was quite strongly developed on the part of the prosecutor and a few witnesses, and the court refused to sustain the first three indictments.

The prosecutor charged that he had seen Robert and Ralph Ashton in their potato bin on Sunday, picking over a few bushels of decaying potatoes, while he was passing by in his automobile, himself on a business errand. The third defendant, Templeton, was charged with having violated the Sunday Law of Tennessee by digging a mess of potatoes out of his garden for dinner on Sunday. The prosecutor and his private stenographer admitted that these were all the charges that they could bring against these three men, after having watched them for nearly two years to see whether they could not catch them working on Sunday. The cases were thrown out of court.

The next cases, those of Mr. Robinson and his son, were submitted to the jury. Ten of the jury were for acquittal, but the other two had strong religious prejudices and refused to yield. A mistrial resulted, and these cases were passed over to the next term of court.

The defendant Robinson is an old man, a citizen of Sumner County, who has always lived an exemplary life. He and his son kept the seventh day, but out of respect for his neighbor who observed Sunday, he does not follow his usual occupation on that day.

His family complained of the fines, and he took the screen door to his little shop to mend it, not knowing that he was being watched and spied upon by Peter Bright, a neighbor, who at that moment was preparing to set out on a twenty-mile journey, in order to reach his home in Nashville early the following morning. I took the following from the address of Attorney Baskerville of the Tennessee State Bar Association:

"The Attorney General ridiculed the excuse of the old man, and told the jury only part of what he said. The prisoner said, 'I lacked part of a chair, and Sunday afternoon I pulled down the shop blinds (and he criticised him for that) because I had given my word to deliver the job Monday morning, and I had not been able to finish it.' He also says, 'I had a daughter in the infirmary, and I needed the money at once to pay the bill.' The old man endeavored to fulfill his promise."

"I want to get into the class with this man. I have worked more than an hour and a half to get out something on Sunday. I have as much regard for Sunday as any man; but I have gone quietly to my office and worked an hour and more on Sunday afternoon, getting out something that I was not able to get out before. You all have done a little something; but Peter Bright says it's wrong to work on Sunday, and yet he'll travel twenty miles to get to his work early Monday morning. I say that pre-conceived opinion and religious prejudice has been working on some people."

MONEY TALKS.

By HERBERT BENINGTON.

Copyright, 1922, (New York Evening World)
by Press Publishing Company, 1922.

WHEN AND WHY?

What part of our incomes should we save?

Savings banks that have studied the matter figure that a single man or woman earning \$1,200 a year should save \$15 per month. Pay day is the time to take or mail our money to the bank. If we are paid on Saturday and do not make the deposit then we are apt to spend, during the week-end, what we should have laid away—perhaps a theatrical dinner or both.

A year later both dinner and theatre will have been forgotten, but had we deposited and left that money in the bank, our bank books would then show how that amount had helped and accumulated a larger sum which will ever be working for our security and independence.